1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 11 GLORISMEL JESUS CENTENO, Civil No. 07-0993 BTM (BLM) 12 Petitioner. ORDER DISMISSING CASE 13 v. WITHOUT PREJUDICE UNKNOWN, 14 Respondent. 15 Petitioner, a federal detainee proceeding pro se, has filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas 16 Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. 17 FAILURE TO SATISFY THE FILING FEE REQUIREMENT 18 Petitioner has failed to pay the \$5.00 filing fee and has failed to move to proceed in forma 19 pauperis. Because this Court cannot proceed until Petitioner has either paid the \$5.00 filing fee 20 or qualified to proceed in forma pauperis, the Court **DISMISSES** the case without prejudice. 21 See Rule 3(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254. 22 CLAIMS NOT COGNIZABLE UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2254 23 Although Petitioner has filed this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, he is a federal 24 detainee attacking the validity of his federal detention. Therefore, Petitioner may not proceed 25 under section 2254, but may only proceed with a habeas action in federal court under 28 U.S.C. 26 27

28

¹ On May 16, 2007, a criminal complaint was filed against Centeno for a violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326 and he was appointed counsel. (*See United States v. Centeno*, 07mj1055 JMA [doc. No. 2].) The claims raised in the Petition appear to relate to that criminal action.

§ 2241. White v. Lambert, 370 F.3d 1002, 1006-07 (9th Cir. 2004) (holding that section 2254 is the proper jurisdictional basis for a habeas petition brought by an individual "in custody pursuant to a state court judgment"). Furthermore, Petitioner has adequate remedies in the pending criminal proceeding which he must exhaust before proceeding by Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. Thus, the Petition is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure to satisfy the filing fee requirement and because Petitioner's claims are to be raised in the pending criminal case. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: June 18, 2007 Hon. Barry Ted Moskowitz United States District Judge